

**Purdue University**  
**Purdue e-Pubs**

---

Purdue Linguistics, Literature, and Second  
Language Studies Conference

PLLS 2019 Proceedings

---

Sep 29th, 11:30 AM

# Linguistic Ideologies in the Performance of Bulgarian Identity

Chelsey Norman  
[crnorma2@illinois.edu](mailto:crnorma2@illinois.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/plcc>



Part of the [American Studies Commons](#), [Classics Commons](#), [Comparative Literature Commons](#), [Digital Humanities Commons](#), [English Language and Literature Commons](#), [Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#), [Medieval Studies Commons](#), [Modern Languages Commons](#), [Modern Literature Commons](#), and the [Other Languages, Societies, and Cultures Commons](#)

---

Norman, Chelsey, "Linguistic Ideologies in the Performance of Bulgarian Identity" (2019). *Purdue Linguistics, Literature, and Second Language Studies Conference*. 4.  
<https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/plcc/2019/papers/4>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact [epubs@purdue.edu](mailto:epubs@purdue.edu) for additional information.

## **Linguistic Ideologies in the Performance of Bulgarian Identity**

Chelsey Norman

### **Abstract**

Since the end of Communism in 1989 and joining the European Union in 2007, Bulgarians have experienced much greater mobility and access to the global community. Despite this more global perspective, Bulgarians maintain a strong sense of national identity. Given this interplay between global and national identities, Bulgaria is an apt location to conduct this ideological research. Using a combination of ethnographic observations (June-July 2018) and semi-structured interviews with bilingual Bulgarians in Sofia, this study examines how large-scale phenomena like nationalism and globalization are found in the micro-scale interactional construction of identity. Results show that a great deal of ideological work goes into the construction of these intersectional identities in Bulgaria. English use authorizes a global identity while Bulgarian and its Cyrillic orthography authenticate the national identity. This study addresses the role that language plays in how individuals construct both national and global identities. The effects of globalization actively influence language ideologies and affect how Bulgarians interactionally construct their own identities and create some balance between local/global or national/international forces. This paper addresses how these phenomena of nationalism and globalization are utilized in the linguistic ideologies that motivate the construction of individuals' identities in Bulgaria.

*Keywords:* identity, linguistic ideologies, nationalism, critical discourse analysis, Bulgaria

## 1. Introduction

In the 19th century, European nationalist movements embraced the ideologies of one nation-one language-one culture and standardized language. While these essentializing ideologies have been theorized (Anderson 1991) and critiqued (Silverstein 2000), they are robustly represented in folk linguistics to construct national identities. These nationalist linguistic ideologies, however, need to be re-evaluated through the lens of extensive globalization that has characterized modernity. Modernity and globalization have brought unprecedented mobility between communities and new, highly mobile, social milieux. These new contexts require communities to reevaluate long-held ideologies and construct ways of existing in a global world. It is important to explicate how these new contexts are producing new identities.

Bulgaria is a unique locale for this project; it is a homogeneous country with a strong national identity constructed from, in part, language ideologies. If you speak Bulgarian, you must *be* Bulgarian. Globalization is a new element in this stable ideological landscape. Mobility allows Bulgarians more opportunities to travel or work in an international marketplace (either in Bulgaria or abroad). These flows of contact afforded by globalization are expected to alter and potentially disrupt the linguistic and cultural stability of place. This paper will consider how Bulgarians discursively construct both national and global identities. Critical Discourse Analysis and Bucholtz and Hall's (2004) *tactics of intersubjectivity* will be used to analyze interviews and ethnographic data collected in Bulgaria in June and July 2018. These data show how old and new ideologies are evoked and shape each other especially in spaces where multilingual practices are developing and speakers are using linguistic choice to either align with a Bulgarian national identity or a global identity (indexed through English use). The analysis of the data revealed two novel ideologies: 1) the Bulgarian language and the Cyrillic script authenticate and authorize the

Bulgarian identity while 2) knowledge of English and other languages (especially other European languages) authenticate and authorize a global identity that also indexes modernity and mobility. Specifically, the data suggest the construction of Bulgarian national identity is tied to the Cyrillic script, which serves as an ideologically strong authenticating force.

Section 2 reviews of the relevant history of Bulgaria, language ideologies, the tactics of intersubjectivity (Bucholtz and Hall 2004), and the hypotheses about which ideologies would be fundamental in the Bulgarian production of identity. Section 3 discusses methodology and results and discussion are found in section 4. Finally, the implications of language ideologies and their role in the construction of interactional identity will be discussed with a specific focus how micro-scale, interactional identity is essential to the macro-scale, ideological work of nationality or globalization.

## **2. Literature Review**

This study extends the present understanding of how identity construction can be directly influenced by the large-scale phenomenon like globalization, the worldwide spread of English, and the emergence of the European Union (EU) as a political force. Bulgaria is neither the center nor the periphery of economic globalization and cannot be viewed as either colonized or colonizer. This in-betweenness is a place that has not been well-studied and challenges established understandings of place and person. A social historiography will situate Bulgaria and demonstrate its unique place in a globalized world.

### **2.1 History of Bulgaria and the Bulgarian Language**

The year 681 CE is the date recognized to be the start of the First Bulgarian Empire. Bulgarians proudly proclaim that Bulgaria is the oldest named country in Europe. It was during this Empire, in the 9th century AD, that the Cyrillic alphabet was created and Christianity was adopted. In 1018, Bulgaria became part of the Byzantine Empire and in 1185, Bulgarian nobles

rebelled and began the Second Bulgarian Empire. The First and Second Bulgarian Empires are considered the Golden Age of Bulgaria. Then the Ottomans invaded and occupied Bulgaria from the 1396 until the 1878. Russia came to Bulgaria's aid to oust the Ottomans and the Treaty of San Stefano gave Bulgaria a huge territory. Western Europe did not approve of this huge Bulgarian territory that may have been under the influence of Russia. The boundaries of Bulgaria were drastically reduced in the 1878 Treaty of Berlin. Bulgaria then spent the first half of the 20th century trying to regain lost territories specifically Macedonia. Bulgaria spent the second half of the 20th century as a Communist country. After 1989, Bulgaria became a democracy and in 2007 Bulgaria joined the European Union (Crampton 2005).

This long history contributes to strong nationalist ideologies that in turn solidify the imagined community of the Bulgarian nation today. One of the most salient features is the Bulgarian language and script. This script was first created by Cyril and Methodius. These brothers/monks came from Thessaloniki and were commissioned to create a script for the Bulgarian language that could be used in the Orthodox Church. They ultimately created the Glagolitic alphabet which was then reformed by Cyril's student Kliment of Ohrid. This reformed version was closer to the modern Cyrillic alphabet. Having a Slavic script allowed the Bulgarian Church to have autonomy from both the Greek and Roman Church but also allowed Bulgarians to understand their church services (Crampton 2005).

After creating a script, literary works could be written in the vernacular. The push for a literate public and standard Bulgarian language did not occur until the eighteenth century. The concept of the imagined community relies heavily on print media because a newspaper served as a voice transmitting a particular narrative. “[T]he single most important factor in the construction of a national consciousness was the creation of a standard and obligatory national language and

education” (Todorova 1995: 77). More recently, Bulgaria has claimed an ideology of the “Bulgarian Ethnic Model” which presents Bulgaria as ethnically and linguistically homogeneous with no racism or discrimination (Rechel 2007). This model, while not true, helps create the ideology of a unitary nation, language, and culture.

Much like the year 681 CE, Bulgarians' claim to the Cyrillic alphabet further roots national identity into a long and glorious history. Appealing to this historical longevity strengthens the nationalist ideology of Bulgaria while standard language and orthography ties all Bulgarians together into an imagined community that shares one nation, one language, and one culture. These historically rooted ideologies become all the more important because Bulgarians feel pressure to differentiate and bolster a national identity as separate and unique in the face of ever expanding and homogenizing globalization. With a strong, secure national identity, Bulgarians are freed to simultaneously embrace new ideologies and foreign languages.

## 2.2 Language Ideologies

Ideologies are social constructs shared by a group. They are internalized beliefs about how society functions (van Dijk 1995: 243). Language ideology is generally considered to be “a mediating link between social structures and forms of talk” (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994: 55). More specifically, language ideologies are “not only consciously held *attitudes* of the masses that such elite actors are supporting or transforming but also those deep-rooted, often unconscious *beliefs* which usually remain unnoticed by their holders and even scholars” (Kulyk 2010: 80). These attitude and beliefs are revealed through everyday communications and also through metapragmatic discussions during interviews.

## 2.3 Tactics of Intersubjectivity

*Tactics of intersubjectivity* explicate how identity is created through language (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 383). These tactics come in three pairs: 1) **adequation** and **distinction**, 2)

**authentication** and **denaturalization**, and 3) **authorization** and **illegitimation**. Adequation occurs when two different groups are made to be similar (though not necessary equal). Hodges (2007) provides an excellent example that very aptly illustrates the adequation of Al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein by President George W. Bush. This adequation provided a justification for the invasion of Iraq following 9/11. Distinction is often an "*us* versus *them*" and many studies have argued that this the main way that identity is created (van Dijk 2006: 125-6). Authentication could take the form of a government *authenticating* a particular version of history as the legitimate and "true" history. Blommaert (2010) discusses the story of a refugee to the UK named Joseph. Joseph has his authenticity as "a refugee from Rwanda" questioned because his linguistic resources are not the expected profile. Authentication is also often used in nationalist rhetoric to create an autochthonous identity contra new, modern, and global conceptions of identity. Authorization is the power to legitimate an identity. Standard language, as taught by a government authority as it is vested into the school system, is the authorized and legitimate language. Given a standard language, non-standard varieties are subject to the process of illegitimation. This might be, for example, a teacher not accepting a student's answer because it is not given in the standard, legitimate, and authorized language.

## **2.4 Hypotheses and Significance**

Based on previous research into ideologies and identity construction, this study hypothesized that Bulgarians would exhibit various language ideologies in their everyday interactions. It was expected that a standard language ideology, a "one nation-one language-one culture" ideology, and a language as commodity ideology would be found. It was also expected that Bulgarians would exhibit favorable views towards Russia and the Russian language. This was hypothesized given the historically friendly relationship between the two countries and recent surveys of Bulgarians about topics related to democracy and government (Pew Research Center,

2009) indicating that Bulgarians favor characteristics more similar to Russia than to Western Europe or the United States. The first three ideologies were substantiated in this project but the hypothesis involving attitudes toward Russia was not corroborated. This may be an artifact of the community that the researcher had access to while conducting research.

Two novel ideologies were discovered at work in the creation of the Bulgarian habitus. The first was a shared European community ideology wherein Bulgarians could take a stance of solidarity with a European or global community. The second: a Cyrillic orthography ideology was the most salient for constructing a Bulgarian national identity. This powerful ideology took precedent over all of the other ideologies. While seeming contradictory, Bulgarians could easily deploy, without contradiction, identities as a Bulgarian and as a global citizen. This study is significant because it uncovered new ideologies at work in the Bulgarian habitus. Specifically, this connection between the Cyrillic alphabet, Bulgarian history, and the modern Bulgarian identity is a completely new way of understanding how Bulgarians construct national identity. These ideologies will be further discussed in Section 4.

### **3. Methods**

The data for this study came from interviews and ethnographic observation in Bulgaria in June and July 2018. Interviews were conducted with four native Bulgarians who were at least bilingual in Bulgarian and English. There were two men and two women who were aged mid-twenties to mid-thirties. All interviewees had completed bachelor's level university degrees or higher. All interviews were conducted in English, recorded, and transcribed.

The methodological framework for analysis was Critical Discourse Analysis (van Dijk 2006, 2015) and more specifically the Discourse-Historical Method (de Cillia et. al. 1999, Wodak 2001, Wodak et. al. 2009). According to van Dijk, Critical Discourse Analysis is not itself a



methodology but a perspective or orientation that aids in the investigation of "relations between social macro- and micro-structures" (van Dijk 2015: 467) and the power relations therein. Language ideologies are the macrostructures that are mediated through interactional microstructures. The Discourse-Historical Method is interdisciplinary and emphasizes the importance of historical context to inform the understanding of how identities are constructed through discourse. This historical focus is particularly important given the appeal to historical narratives integral to the observed ideologies.

This ethnographically grounded qualitative study provides insights into how Bulgarians use and approach language thus revealing ideological stances. Positioned as a naive outsider, I could ask more basic questions that elicited participants to provide relevant historical background information. This approach helped to expose otherwise potentially invisible language ideologies. While it cannot be claimed that these interviews and ethnographic observations are representative, they certainly capture some portion of Bulgarians' language ideologies. The limitations of this study are those common to all qualitative studies. Future work triangulating the results of this study with new data and other methodological approaches will allow for more robust conclusions. However, because part of this study confirms previously observed language ideologies, I am confident that more supporting evidence would be found of these newly observed ideologies.

#### **4. Results and Discussion**

This section discusses how the tactics of intersubjectivity are utilized by speakers to discursively construct identity through the ideologically charged interaction. Evidence of the three expected ideologies of standard language, "one nation-one language-one culture" ideology, and the neoliberal idea of language as a commodity/resource will be provided before turning to the ideology of a European community and finally to the Cyrillic orthography ideology.

##### **4.1 Ideology #1: Standard Language**

A standard language is recognized as the authentic and authorized language of a country (Fairclough 1989, Gal 2006). This ideology can become so powerful so as to be invisible and unquestioned. This is the case in Bulgaria, it is simply assumed that all Bulgarians speak Bulgarian and attempts at distinction between dialects or accents are acknowledged but downplayed (e.g., Bulgarians in the east sound "softer" than those in the west). Standard language ideology is deployed when speakers appeal to the authority of the Bulgarian Academy to determine whether or not a word is in fact Bulgarian. This can be seen in Extract 1 when the interviewee appeals to the Bulgarian Academy as evidence that the word "email" is now a Bulgarian word. In addition to appealing to an authority, speaker D in Extract 1 below defended the integrity of the Bulgarian language by arguing that the Bulgarians are not mixing language, they are just adding to the richness and variety of Bulgarian.

**Extract 1**

- D: Email is a Bulgarian word already you can find it in the in the official Bulgarian dictionary from 2012 I have checked that [uh yeah ]  
 I: [oh ]  
 D: yeah and its issued by the Bulgarian Academy of Science. [So]  
 I: [uhhuh]  
 D: it's already adop-[ted]  
 I: [Ok]  
 D: and PR also and the word for a PR person female or male we have them two separate words PR PR actually also means in Bulgarian a male PR person and PRka is a female PR person. (D)

Also, in Extract 1, the adoption of "PR" (for public relations) shows that this word has been adopted and modified with Bulgarian morphology. First, the term is not just written as an abbreviation like in English ("PR") but is spelled out phonetically in the Cyrillic script "пиар." The morphology is also adapted to Bulgarian because of the feminine ending (-ка) to indicate a female person who does PR work "пиарка" /piarkə/. This word is written differently and takes Bulgarian morphology serving to authorize its usage as Bulgarian.

Extract 2 involves an interviewee, B, discussing their dislike of codeswitching. This is another argument that has traditionally been used for preserving the integrity of a single, standard language that should not be muddled with foreign words. While previously acknowledging that many words have foreign sources, B finds this catchphrase "I love you guys" (said in English) irritating because B wants his friend to use his own native language to express this sentiment.

**Extract 2**

I have a serious problem with people using foreign words when you have the exact same words in your own language because you're losing you're losing your words and it's not a territorial thing and I don't mind other people's languages. It's nothing like that. But to give you example uh the sentence I love you guys. I love you guys has become a sentence I've heard over the past few weeks from the same person in English just as I'm saying it now. We have the same sentence in Bulgarian. And we have our our words. Why don't you just say "обичам ми хопа." Why don't you just say that? Why you have to say it in English? (B)

B is denaturalizing their friend's use of English and wishing their friend would be more authentic in declarations of fond feelings towards friends. Because this friend was not interviewed, it is difficult to determine what the friend's intentions are in using this English phrase "I love you guys."

**4.2 Ideology #2: One Nation-One Language**

The "one nation-one language-one culture" ideology is similar to the standard language ideology in its power and therefore its invisibility. It is different from the standard language ideology in that it is not linked to language policies imposed by the government. This ideology focused on the common sensical belief that the territory of Bulgaria is filled with people who all belong to the same nation, speak the same language, and share the same culture. This erasure of minorities helps bolster this already strong ideology of the "Bulgarian Ethnic Model" (Rechel 2007). In fact, the ideology linking the Bulgarian nation to a particular territory is so strong that Bulgarians find it difficult to acknowledge that Macedonian is a separate language from Bulgarian (Irvine and Gal 2000: 69). Bulgarians authorize their own existence by illegitimizing the existence of Macedonian. By no means clear cut, the relationship between Bulgarians and Macedonians is

an interesting distinction that merits further study (on both sides of the border). Asking about Macedonia and the Macedonian language in Bulgaria could very quickly reveal ideological positioning. Nationalist language ideologies are well-studied (Blommaert 2005, de Cillia et. al. 1999, Gal 2006, Errington 1998, Blommaert and Verschueren 1998) but this particular relationship requires more study (Todorova 1995).

**Extract 3**

Macedonian is Bulgarian with a Serbian accent ((laughter)) so, yes, Macedonian is very easy to understand. (F)

**Extract 4**

A lot of people consider Macedonian to be Bulgarian. Um, as a matter of fact, it used to be a dialect of Bulgarian. It still is. That is what most of the people believe because the territories of Macedonia used to be part of the territories of Bulgaria for centuries. Uh it's only the 20th century when they separated uh due to the. Complicated geopolitical situation on the Balkans. And if you could go, let's say, to the western parts of Bulgaria. If you go to the city of Tran, the Bulgarian that they speak there, it's identical to the language they speak in current Macedonia. Ah because they are very close to each other. Like it's the same territories which is only split by a border and this is why a lot of Bulgarians consider that Macedonian, it is Bulgarian, it's just a dialect of it. And it's also easy understand it. I wou- don't have any problems in understanding people speaking Macedonian. (H)

This complex relationship between modern Macedonia and modern Bulgaria is sensitive because the very existence of Macedonia as an independent country puts into question the ideology of one nation-one language-one culture. Because Bulgarian is often defined by either language or the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, Macedonia should be part of Bulgaria because Bulgarians perceive that Macedonians have the same language and religion.

**Extract 5**

This language [Macedonian] was falsely created. There was actually a pretty good, uh story here on TV, uh they made an entire, uh report about how the Macedonian State, the **modern** Macedonian state, was created. How the Macedonian language was created and for what purposes. And again that's just, uuh, it's bullshit but when you start stealing someone's history, people tend to get sensi- uh pretty sensitive. For example, uh our writers all of sudden become their writers. (B)

**Extract 6**

In, in, in their, in their capital in Skopje they're building statues of all these world leaders. From the past. Like Alexander the Great, one of these Bulgarian kings as well, Samuil, and some other historic figures. Uh to ki- to kind of create their grand history and identity. But it's very annoying for all their neighbors (F)

These negative attitudes toward the modern Macedonian state are an attempt to delegitimize the Macedonian claim to an authentic language and history distinct from Bulgaria. These tactics evidence, albeit sometimes opaquely, the ideology that Bulgarian is a unitary language for the one nation and culture of Bulgaria (be it some larger imagined historical territory or within modern-day borders).

#### **4.3 Ideology #3: English as Commodity/Resource**

The neoliberal ideology where language is viewed as a resource or a commodity was also found. English is viewed as a practical tool that allows Bulgarians to gain real or symbolic capital.

##### **Extract 7**

It's the, language of the world it's, what can I say? (D)

##### **Extract 8**

That's, actually, part of the reason a lot of people learn English. Is it's the sensible thing to do. Everyone speaks English. So if you don't, you're, not able to communicate with as many people. Right? E- or you just have to weigh what's important for you. (B)

English allows a person to either communicate with many more people or to get a good job. This reveals an adaptable, resourceful, and capable identity for a global market.

Finally, B provides an extended history of why they believe that "English was a given." B refers to the power of English in terms of the Cold War. During the Cold War, Russian was the language of power given Bulgaria's position in the Soviet sphere of influence. Once the Cold War ended, the US was the perceived winner and English became the global language of power.

##### **Extract 10**

English well here's the thing English was a given because uh you know uh a little bit of politics. Prior to 1991 1989, 1991 that period. Prior to that Russian was the given language you have to study because we were under the influence of the Soviet Union etcetera and after that the Soviet Union is gone and it's not that Russian lost its popularity immediately but it drastically decreased in popularity and the new thing became uh

English because of the who's the supposed winner of the Cold War. The United States so and it's just a language that's been that's been spoken everywhere. You can't go uh in any place in the world. There's going to be at least one person that speaks English. It might be the worst English in the world but he's gonna he's gonna understand you so it's sort of became uhh understand everybody language so it's a given uhh again I'm saying TV and music. The popularity of Cartoon Network it, now it's translated. When I was a little child that wasn't translated so Powerpuff Girls or any other cartoon that I've been watching for hours kind of left left its mark (B)

B continues from the historical to the pervasiveness of English in the media. They remember being a child and all of the popular television, cartoons, and music were in English. Because it was just after Communism, television shows, and cartoons had not been dubbed into Bulgarian yet. Once B was old enough, they could read the subtitles but B feels that this exposure to English really made English a "given" to learn. While all this is helpful for understanding how Bulgarians might learn English, B still only appeals to the idea of English as a commodity. It can provide entertainment but is also "spoken everywhere" and thus a valuable commodity.

This ideology of English as a resource is very interesting for identity formation. If anything, English was used to further authenticate a Bulgarian identity because the speakers' English use was denaturalized and presented as non-genuine. This global identity, then, that Bulgarians deploy through the use of English, is not salient to them but is nevertheless there because they identify with the broader European or global community.

#### **4.4 Ideology #4: Global/European Community**

This next ideology occurs when speakers discursively construct Bulgaria as part of some greater whole, either as a part of the European Union or part of a global community of nations. This involves the tactics of adequation and authorization. While this might, in the short term, weaken Bulgaria's profit of distinction, it elevates Bulgaria to global stage so that, in the long term, Bulgaria's distinction might be displayed to a larger global audience. Consequently, Bulgarians need to do a lot of ideological work to bring Bulgaria on par with other countries in the EU before

sharing the distinct, rich culture of Bulgaria. Since Bulgaria joined the EU in 2007, they are, in theory, members whose languages receive equal status. All languages in the European Union receive official status within the union are therefore automatically authorized by the EU government. This authorization greatly aids in the deployment of this global community ideology. In being an EU member, the Bulgarian language is authorized and adequated with all of the other languages of Europe. In Extract 11, H is discussing the importance of the EU for Bulgarians and how joining Europe is a positive outcome for everyone.

**Extract 11**

Yes, um it [the European Union] has played an an important role, uh for for Bulgarians. And the best thing about the European Union is that all of the languages, of all the countries are considered as official, languages. So. There are official working languages, which are English, French, and German. Um but all of the other languages are, important, because it's the, uh cultural diversity of every culture and every nation part of the European Union. So, um there are a lot of projects under the European Union that stimulate this intercultural exchange and especially, um learning foreign languages as well. They have an idea every European citizen to speak at least two languages apart from his, uh native one. Like, at least the native language and another one at least one. So they have a lot of intercultural exchanges. This youth program called Erasmus, uh which is for intercultural exchange of students. They're going, they're, spending quite some time, a couple of months, abroad in the, another country and they're studying, eh, in a completely different environment. And I think thi- this helps a lot. (H)

In Extract 11, H discusses how joining the EU provided this authorization and also the EU's role in promoting language learning. All interviewees agreed that joining the EU provided a multitude of new opportunities for study and work outside of Bulgaria. Extract 11 emphasizes the EU community, that Bulgaria is now a part of, where students can participate in "intercultural exchanges" to experience a new environment and get out of "your own little bubble."

**4.5 Ideology #5: Cyrillic Orthography**

The Cyrillic orthography ideology was that most productive and most salient ideology for the Bulgarians in this research project. The Cyrillic alphabet's foundational impact on Bulgarian identity nearly always came up as soon as I began speaking with someone and they learned of my

interest in the Bulgarian language and learning to speak Bulgarian. This ideology helped Bulgarians to discursively construct an authentic, authorized, and distinct Bulgarian identity.

**Extract 12**

The Cyrillic alphabet, um imagine that Bulgaria, um created the Cyrillic alphabet for one very practical reason. Um. at the time when it was created, uh we had just became a Christian country. We converted to Christianity in the ninth century. So from that point onward all- Christianity was introduced on the territories of Bulgaria but the only languages that was preached in was Latin and Greek so the local population of Bulgaria didn't speak neither Latin nor Greek and, they, had their own language. But the main difference was that our language back then didn't have an alphabet. So this is when our one of our tsars, one of our kings, came up with an idea, to, um give a ta- this task to create, uh an alphabet for for for the Bulgarian nation to two brothers because after that if we had an alphabet we could translate everything from Latin and Greek to. our. language. And everyone would be able to understand and it would be easier for them to fa- it would facilitate the transition from Paganic to Christianity. Also in terms of a political move it would made Bulgaria completely autonomous. We won't have to, uhm, have anything in common neither with, uh Greece nor uh Rome at that time. (H)

This narrative reveals all three tactics of identity formation. The common people did not speak Latin or Greek, they spoke their own *authentic* language. By making Bulgarian the language of the church, Bulgarian became authorized. This independence was not only religious but also political. This move to create an alphabet, according to the narrative, made Bulgaria an autonomous nation. This political motive is another form of authorization for the Bulgarian language. Finally, by creating a new alphabet specific to Bulgaria, Bulgarians create a distinction between themselves and both Rome and (especially) Greece. This alphabet also created a path for the Orthodox Church to become completely distinct from the Greek Orthodox Church.

**Extract 13**

the Cyrillic alphabet, it was, it was created in, it was created by two Bulgarian monks, which were then Bulgarian and, that we created an alph-, uh these not **we** because I haven't created anything but the people who were of this descent have created an alphabet and and, have their own literature, their own language, their own music, their own culture which is kind of being lost partially because people don't care anymore. People, people are occupied with other things, now. And traditional, truly just the essence of traditional Bulgarian culture is being lost. Good or bad, whatever it is. Put any evaluation on it. It's being lost. (B)



Extract 13 is another example of the mythic creation story of the Cyrillic alphabet and its power as a physical manifestation evidencing the authorized, authentic, and distinct Bulgarian national identity.

B corroborates H's narrative about the Cyrillic alphabet in much less detail but interestingly juxtaposes himself with the original creators of the alphabet and purveyors of Bulgarian culture. Using deictics again, B corrects from "we created an alph-" to "[they] created an alphabet." This is an interesting correction but it allows B to continue and explain that Bulgaria is losing its traditional cultural. "They," the creators of the alphabet, literature, language, music, culture were the authentic Bulgarians. B and his contemporaries today are disassociated from this "they." Constructing this modern identity seems to have to do with the preceding discussion in the interview about English. This perceived global homogenizing force might be why B constructed this distinction or dissimilarity between himself and the culture when the alphabet was created. This is an interesting turn in the B's narrative but without further data this hypothesis of a modern versus traditional ideology must remain speculation.

## **5. Conclusion**

This paper explored the interrelation between language ideology and nationalism and globalization. There were five ideologies found in the data: standard language, one nation-one language-one culture, language as a commodity/resource, Cyrillic orthography, and global community. These ideologies are social structures that are deployed in interaction. These interactions, in addition to revealing ideologies, discursively construct identities. The interplay between national and global identities in Bulgaria illustrate these ideologies.

Based on previous research of ideologies and identity construction in different social milieux, this study has both replicated previous findings from the ideology research and revealed

two new ideologies. First, the ideology of the Cyrillic alphabet reveals the strength of the Bulgarian national identity. Second, with a secure national identity, Bulgarians are able to identify with a global community (without threaten of homogenization). The open and outwardly oriented perspective allows Bulgarians to simultaneously identify as Bulgarian, European, and even as global citizens. Future study will further investigate these new ideologies using different methodologies for the purpose of triangulation. Further research in this area could also ascertain whether or not these newly documented ideologies are unique to the Bulgarian socio-historical situation. Finally, this study is an important contribution to the understanding of ideologies and how national identities are discursively constructed in a brave new globalized world.

## References

- Anderson, Benedict. (1991 [1983]). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. London: Verso.
- Blommaert, Jan. (2005). *Discourse*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, Jan. (2010). *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, Jan, and Jef Verschueren. (1998 [1992]). The Role of Language in European Nationalist Ideologies. In *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*, eds. Bambi Schieffelin, Kathryn Woolard, and Paul Kroskrity, pp. 189-210. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bucholtz, Mary, and Kira Hall. (2004). Language and Identity. In *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, ed. Alessandro Duranti, pp. 369-394. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Crampton, R.J. (2005). *A Concise History of Bulgaria*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- de Cillia, Rudolf, Riesigl, Martin, and Ruth Wodak. (1999). The discursive construction of national identities. *Discourse & Society* 10(2): 149-173.
- “End of Communism Cheered but Now with More Reservations.” Pew Research Center, Washington, D.C. (2 November 2009) <https://www.pewglobal.org/2009/11/02/end-of-communism-cheered-but-now-with-more-reservations/>.
- Errington, Joseph. Indonesian('s) Development: On the State of a Language of State. (1998). In *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*, eds. Bambi Schieffelin, Kathryn Woolard, and Paul Kroskrity, pp. 271-284. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fairclough, Norman. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.

- Gal, Susan. (2006). Contradictions of standard language in Europe: Implications for the study of practices and publics. *Social Anthropology* 14(2): 163-181.
- Hodges, Adam. (2007). The Narrative Construction of Identity: The Adequation of Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden in the 'War on Terror'. In *Discourse, War and Terrorism*, eds. Adam Hodges and Chad Nilep, pp. 67-87.
- Irvine, Judith T and Susan Gal. (2000). Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation. In *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*, ed. Paul Kroskrity, pp. 35-83. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Kulyk, Volodymyr. (2010). Ideologies of language use in post-Soviet Ukrainian media. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 201: 79-104. doi 10.1515/IJSL.2010.005
- Rechel, Bernd. (2007). The 'Bulgarian Ethnic Model'—Reality or Ideology? *Europe-Asia Studies* 59(7): 1201-1215.
- Silverstein, Michael. (2000). Whorfianism and the Linguistic Imagination of Nationality. In *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*, ed. Paul Kroskrity, pp. 85-138. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Todorova, Maria. (1995). The Course of Discourses of Bulgarian Nationalism. In *Eastern European Nationalism in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Peter F. Sugar, pp. 55-102. Washington, DC: American University Press.
- van Dijk, Teun A. (1995). Discourse semantics and ideology. *Discourse and Society* 6(2): 243-289.
- van Dijk, Teun A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: SAGE Publications.

- van Dijk, Teun A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies* 11(2): 115-140.
- van Dijk, Teun A. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis. In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, ed. Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton, and Deborah Schiffrin, pp. 466-485. 2nd edition. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Wodak, Ruth. (2001). The Discourse-Historical Approach in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, ed. Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, pp. 63-94. London: SAGE Publications.
- Wodak, Ruth, Rudolf de Cillia, Martin Reisigl, and Karin Liebhart. (2009). Semi-Private Opinions: The Qualitative Interviews. In *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*, pp. 146-185. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Woolard, Kathryn and Bambi Schieffelin. (1994). Language Ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23: 55-82.